

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 were pending in this application. Non-elected Claims 13-18 are hereby cancelled without prejudice. New Claims 19-25 have been added. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to better define the scope of the claimed invention.

Applicant affirms the election of Claims 1-12 and acknowledges that Claims 13-18 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The drawings were objected to as not including reference signs mentioned in the description: 106, 614a, 615a, and 618. However, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the right portion of Figure 1, where element 106 is labelled accordingly. Similarly, Figure 6 includes element 618 at the bottommost portion of that Figure. Applicant acknowledges that elements 614a and 615a in Figure 6 were mislabelled. An annotated drawing sheet showing the corrections relating to elements 614a and 615a is attached hereto. A replacement sheet including the corrections is also attached.

Claims 1-3, 9, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0096764). Claim 1, as amended, includes the feature of "a copper stud directly positioned on said copper layer." Claim 11, as amended, includes the feature of "a copper stud directly positioned on said copper layer." Huang does not teach or suggest such a feature. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Huang. Claims 2, 3, 9, and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 11 and are therefore patentable over Huang at least by virtue of their dependence upon a patentable base claim.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Hur, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,494). Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 which is patentable over Huang for the reasons presented above. Hur, cited for its teaching of a copper layer of a particular thickness, does not cure the deficiencies of Huang with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 as well as Claim 4 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Edelstein (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,136). Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 which is patentable over Huang for the reasons presented above. Edelstein, cited for its teaching of a silicon nitride overcoat, does not cure the deficiencies of Huang with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 as well as Claim 5 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Edelstein and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. Claim 6 depends from Claim 1 which is patentable over Huang for the reasons presented above. Edelstein, cited for its teaching of a silicon nitride overcoat and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art cited for its teaching of a sloped window, do not cure the deficiencies of Huang with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 as well as Claim 6 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Gansauge, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,010,389). Claims 7 and 8 depend from Claim 1 which is patentable over Huang for the reasons presented above. Gansauge and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, cited for their teaching of a

polymeric layer with a particular thickness as well as a sloped window perimeter, do not cure the deficiencies of Huang with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 as well as Claims 7 and 8 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Kleffner, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,597). Claim 10 depends from Claim 1 which is patentable over Huang for the reasons presented above. Kleffner, cited for its teaching of a copper stud of a particular thickness, does not cure the deficiencies of Huang with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 as well as Claim 10 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited combination of references.

New Claim 19 includes the feature of "a copper stud positioned on said copper layer and following the contours of said copper layer, said copper stud at least a factor of ten thicker than said copper layer." The references of record do not teach or suggest such a feature. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 19 as well as Claims 20-25 depending therefrom are patentable over those references. Support for Claim 19 can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-12 and 19-25. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. Skrehot", written in a cursive style.

Michael K. Skrehot
Reg. No. 36,682

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: 972 917-5653
Fax: 972 917-4418



FIG. 6

